



CHULA VISTA

MOBILEHOME PARK CLOSURE ORDINANCE UPDATE PUBLIC MEETING

**Tuesday, May 8, 2007
5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.**

**CHULA VISTA CITY HALL
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
276 FOURTH AVENUE
CHULA VISTA CA 91910**

MEETING NOTES

Staff provided a presentation that included a summary of: comments that were received during the first round of workshops, research of other jurisdiction's ordinances, and three options for each of the topic areas. After each set of options were provided, attendees were asked to provide comment on that topic. A summary of the comments received are provided below.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Attendees were concerned that more notice was not provided and that some parks did not post the notice as requested.

RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL TO PURCHASE PARK

Staff identified a court opinion from 1990 that ruled it was unconstitutional to require residents be notified of a potential sale of the park unless an established association exists. Therefore no options for change to our ordinance were provided.

NOTIFICATION

- Consensus was for "Option C".

TENANT RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

- No comments were provided.

RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

- There was concern that no spaces are available for coaches to be moved.

MOBILEHOME VALUE

- Various attendees were concerned that park owners have indicated that they cannot sell their coach/trailer “in-place” due to age and/or condition and therefore the coach/trailer has little or no value.
- Some attendees were concerned whether they would get their money back from the improvements that they have made in their coach/trailer.
- Approximately 1/3 of attendees preferred “Option B”, indicating that this was a better option for people with older trailers.
- Approximately 2/3 of attendees preferred “Option C”.



CHULA VISTA

MOBILEHOME PARK CLOSURE ORDINANCE UPDATE RESIDENTS STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP MEETING

**Thursday, May 10, 2007
9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.**

**CHULA VISTA POLICE DEPARTMENT
COMMUNITY MEETING ROOM
315 FOURTH AVENUE
CHULA VISTA CA 91910**

MEETING NOTES

Staff provided a presentation that included a summary of: comments that were received during the first round of workshops, research of other jurisdiction's ordinances, and three options for each of the topic areas. After each set of options were provided, attendees were asked to provide comment on that topic. A summary of the comments received are provided below.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Attendees asked for clarification on the overlay zone and general closure process issues.

RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL TO PURCHASE PARK

Staff identified a court opinion from 1990 that ruled it was unconstitutional to require residents be notified of a potential sale of the park unless an established association exists. Therefore no options for change to our ordinance were provided.

- How many residents are required to form an association and how many are needed to purchase the park?

NOTIFICATION

- No comments were provided.

TENANT RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

- Why should a renter in a mobilehome be provided any additional assistance above and beyond what a renter in an apartment complex would be provided?
- Consensus was for "Option A".

RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

- There was concern that no spaces are available for coaches to be moved.
- Would the mileage covered by the options be a radius from the current park or actual mileage.

MOBILEHOME VALUE

- Park owner should be required to pay full retail value including improvements.
- Residents have contributed to property value:
 - Expenses to maintain coach and property.
 - Payment of rent for extended time.
- Why does “Option C” include a percent as opposed to 100% Fair Market? There are costs associated with selling homes and therefore the percent takes this into consideration.
- The age of a coach may not truly reflect value since an older coach may be built better or have been maintained and improved more than a newer coach.
- Very important for the appraiser to be approved by the City.
- Consensus was for “Option C”.

- Mobilehome residents benefit from rent control and will have difficulty paying rent in alternative housing.
 - Need enough affordable housing to accommodate the number of residents that will potentially be displaced.
 - Some residents cannot keep up expense of owning a coach/trailer, therefore how will they afford rent elsewhere?
 - Section 8 is not always accepted at mobilehome parks.



CHULA VISTA

MOBILEHOME PARK CLOSURE ORDINANCE UPDATE OWNERS STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP MEETING

**Thursday, May 10, 2007
2:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.**

**CHULA VISTA POLICE DEPARTMENT
COMMUNITY MEETING ROOM
315 FOURTH AVENUE
CHULA VISTA CA 91910**

MEETING NOTES

Staff provided a presentation that included a summary of: comments that were received during the first round of workshops, research of other jurisdiction's ordinances, and three options for each of the topic areas. After each set of options were provided, attendees were asked to provide comment on that topic. A summary of the comments received are provided below.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Attendees asked if we have differentiated between mobilehome and trailer parks or senior and family parks.
- Overall concerned with the amount of time that the City has been working on the Urban Core Specific Plan and now the Mobilehome Closure Ordinance.
- The City should provide a disclosure to incoming residents regarding the zoning and intent for properties if the park is not zoned as mobilehome park.
- Consideration should be given to a relocation park.
- The mobilehome industry is seeing a large amount of park closures due to inheritance of parks and the desire to use land for more intensive and profitable uses.

RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL TO PURCHASE PARK

Staff identified a court opinion from 1990 that ruled it was unconstitutional to require residents be notified of a potential sale of the park unless an established association exists. Therefore no options for change to our ordinance were provided.

NOTIFICATION

- Attendees asked staff to clarify the State law requiring 6 month notice once the City has "issued permits for a change of use" vs. the 12 month noticing requiring if no action is required by the City.

- How are residents required to be noticed: individually by certified mail?
- Need to make this process very clear for all parties.
- Can we deviate above or below State law?
- Some other jurisdictions recently adopted a 9 month notice.
- Owners are concerned that once residents find out a park is closing they will start leaving, and if the period is too long before redevelopment can occur:
 - The park owner may face financial difficulty due to the lost rent.
 - Residents may let their coach and property deteriorate once they know they will be moving.
 - If transients move in after the owner moves out would they be eligible for relocation benefits?
- Maybe tie the notification to the development process.
- Once residents have been provided with notice of tenancy termination, the residents should be required to disclosure to potential buyers and/or tenants.

TENANT RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

- Could City subsidize?
- Why should mobilehome park tenants receive more benefits than a tenant in an apartment building? They should only receive what state law requires.

RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

- Payment of a rent differential may be placing some people in an artificially affordable situation, once subsidy runs out what will they do?
- Residents have already benefited from rent control, why should park owners bear further burden of providing a rent differential?
- Propose “Option B” with the following changes: delete rent differential, credit security deposit at existing park to lump sum, change mileage to 100, and place a lump sum maximum amount on a single and double wide, payment would be the lesser of the actual or maximum.

MOBILEHOME VALUE

- Can the original purchase price be factored into the current value?
- Rent control transfers a portion of the land value to the space renter.
- Maybe propose “Option B” with the following changes: delete rent differential for all but very low income, credit security deposit at existing park to lump sum, and place a maximum amount on total obligation.
- Where is the equity in providing both the value and relocation?
- A coach owner should not be able to decide not to move if space is available simply because the financial benefit for value is greater. Maybe need to identify that benefit is the lesser of.



CHULA VISTA

MOBILEHOME PARK CLOSURE ORDINANCE UPDATE PUBLIC MEETING

**Thursday, May 10, 2007
5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.**

**CHULA VISTA CITY HALL
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
276 FOURTH AVENUE
CHULA VISTA CA 91910**

MEETING NOTES

Staff provided a presentation that included a summary of: comments that were received during the first round of workshops, research of other jurisdiction's ordinances, and three options for each of the topic areas. After each set of options were provided, attendees were asked to provide comment on that topic. A summary of the comments received are provided below.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Attendees were concerned that more notice was not provided and that some parks did not post the notice as requested.
- What is the likelihood that a number of parks would close at the same time considering market conditions?

RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL TO PURCHASE PARK

Staff identified a court opinion from 1990 that ruled it was unconstitutional to require residents be notified of a potential sale of the park unless an established association exists. Therefore no options for change to our ordinance were provided.

NOTIFICATION

- Section 8 waiting period is too long.
- Would like 3 years.
- Concern if too many people vacate the park may become run down.
- City provided notice of pending closures when the Urban Core Specific Plan was adopted.
- Notice time should be linked to the ability of comparable housing.
- What type of alternative housing is the City providing?
- Consensus was for "Option C".

TENANT RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

- No comments were provided.

RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

- There was concern that no spaces are available for coaches to be moved.
- Need a replacement park.
- Do not want to be forced to move to a park that does not have a comparable life style (i.e. weather, location, amenities).
- Benefit cost should include storage fees for personal belongings.

MOBILEHOME VALUE

- Want burn down insurance replacement value.
 - May benefit trailers more than coaches.
- Want “on-site” fair market value.
 - May benefit coaches more than trailers.
- Park owners do not want to pay anything.
- City wants parks to turn over.
- Why does “Option C” include a % of fair market value?
- Need a replacement park.
- Value of coach does not provide compensation for the loss of lifestyle.
- Both residents and owners want something simple and clear.
- Majority of attendees preferred “Option C”.